AN ADDITION TO THE APOLOGY

For the two Treatises concerning

INFANT-BAPTISME

Published *December* 15. 1645.

In which the Author is Vindicated from 21. unjust Criminations in the 92. page of the Book of Mr. ROBERT BAILLIE Minister of *Glasgow*, INTITULED

ANABAPTISME.

And sundry materiall points concerning the Covenant, Infants-interest in it, and Baptisme by it, *Baptism by an unbaptized person, Dipping, Erastianism and Church-Government*, are argued, in a letter (now enlarged) sent in *September* 1647. to him, by

JOHN TOMBES. B.D.

London, Printed by *Hen. Hills* for *Hen. Crips*, and *Lodowick Lloid*, in Popes-head Alley, *T. Brewster*, and *G. Moule* at the three Bibles at the west end of *Pauls* 1652.

London

ERRATA.

EPiſt. Dedic. Edius reade Edingb. page 2. line 23. viſible r. inviſible, p. 3. l. penul. needleſly r. heedleſly, p. 4 l. 18. obhorrency r. abhorrency, p. 5. l. 7. we r. he l. 8 know r. knew, p. 6 l. 11 Examination r. Crimination, p. 9. l. 20. divert r. derive, p. 10. in margin all in r. Allin, p. 11. l. 10. baptizeter r. baptizetur, p. 12. l. 22 conſiderately r. conſiderate, p. 13. l. 4. deſire r. deviſe, p. 18. l. 6. credible r. incredible, l 26. it ſufficient r. inſufficient, l. 33. right r. rite, p. 25. l. 3. r. nor Mr. p. 28. margin deſign. r. de Syn. p. 29. l. 32. all r. ill, p. 32. l 23. a r. no, p. 33. l. 4. refers r. reſerves, p. 34 l. 19. ſcoffical r. ſcoptical, p. 36. l. 8. no type. r. no leſs

To the Right Honourable Bulstrode Whitlock *Serjeant at Law*, John Lisle *Esq*; Richard Keble *Serjeant at Law, Lords Commissioners of the Great Seal of* England; *Major General* Thomas Harrison; Edmund Prideaux *Esq*; *Atturney General for the State.*

OUt of a love to truth, and respect to my Engagement by Solemn Covenant I trained, and out of desire to prevent (if possible) the oppression of men, for holding a truth, I printed, (some years since) *Two Treatises and an Appendix to them*, and after that an *Apology* for them, with a *Postscript*; which were presented to some of your hands by me. Finding that great hatred is against such as dissent from the *Assemblies* determinations, specially in the two points of *Baptism*, & *Discipline*, (which this writing treats of;) and those that shelter them from violence; and that a great part of the quarrel between *England* and *Scotland* is, for not establishing *Presbyterial* Government, with rigour, which is thus expressed in the *Scottish Assemblies Reply to the Armies Declaration*, Edius. 22. Julii 1650. Sess. 17. *That Jesus Christ be Lord over his own house, and that his Ministers keep Courts and exercise Jurisdiction and discipline, and all the censures of the Kirk from the lowest to the highest, in his name only, against all that depart from and do oppose the truth; or that walk loosely as doth not become the Gospell*: and hoping this writing to one of the *Chief Presbyterians* in *Scotland*. may contribute something to discover the unreasonableness of their violent proceedings in their way; and some Truths, not commonly discern-

cerned; I have yielded to the publiſhing thereof, in this ſad time of a bloody warre, raiſed much from the forementioned hatred.

Such as it is, I humbly preſent to your Honours, in teſtimony of my thankfulneſſe for the favour and pitty to me, vouchſafed by ſome of your Honors in conferring on me, & others in being eminently inſtrumental in the quiet ſettling of me in this place; in which, after plunderings, and many toſſings up and down, I have had ſome abiding: wherein I ſtill endeavour to be ſerviceable to the publique, and to acquit my ſelf

Your Honours humble and

devoted Servant,

JOHN TOMBES.

Ledbury-Hoſpitall
in Hereford ſhire
Sept. 4. 1650.

To the Reverend the Moderator *and* Commissioners *in the next* Nationall Assembly *of the Church of* Scotland, *or the next* Provincial Assembly *unto which* Glasgow *in the Kingdome of* Scotland *belongs*; *the* Complaint *of* John Tombes *Presbyter*,

Humbly sheweth,

THat in pursuance of the SOLEMNE COVENANT taken by me *to endeavour reformation in Gods worship, according to the word of God*; I published *Two Treatises* about INFANT-BAPTISME at *London December* 15. 1645. and an APOLOGY for them in *August* 1646. and that in the year 1647. a book intituled ANABAPTISME was published at *London*, by ROBERT BAYLY *Minister of Glasgow*: wherein I was wronged by many grievous *false accusations*: concerning which I have (as near as I could,) followed the rule of Christ *Mat.* 18. 15, 16, 17. as may be perceived by the close of the letter to Mr. BAYLY himself: For after I had advertised him by Mr. *Henry Scudder*, of the injury he had done me, I wrote to him *July* 22. 1647. which letter was delivered to Mr. *Samuel Rutherford Sept.* 17. 1647. with Directions how to send back. And in the year 1649. I wrote a letter to Mr. *Rutherford*, to certify me what became of my writing delivered to him? with desire to know what Mr. BAYLY would do to right me; yet after so long waiting, I find no remorse or righting of me made by the said Mr. ROBERT BAYLY: And therefore I do devolve the matter into your hands, being taken for the Church, to which such complaints should be made, according to the rule *Mat.* 18. 17. and do expect to have right done by you to him and me, as to a Fellow-Christian,--Presbyter,---and *Covenanter* with you, as is meet in such a cause concerning the *truth* of *God*, and *innocency* of your *Brother*. And forasmuch as the charge against him and proof may be evidently seen in this letter to him, and his and my writings, (which [if you please to take notice of,] you may easily come by;) I presume you will not expect my personal appearance before you to pursue this *Complaint*: but of your selves examine the matter, (as I conceive the rule of Christ binds you; besides the engagements towards a *Fellow-Covenanter* in the *sixth article* of the *Solemne League and Covenant*: and permit your fellow-servant to attend the work of Christ, in the place where he is seated; who shall pray for your welfare; and continue

Your brother and Fellow-
Servant in Christ,
JOHN TOMBES.

London Sept.
24. 1650.

To the Reverend, Mr. Samuel Rutherfurd *Professor at St.* Andrews *in* Scotland.

SIR,

Anno 1647. was delivered to you a letter of mine to Mr. *Robert Bayly* of *Glasgow* your fellow-Commissioner, which you undertook as I am told to send to him, and not hearing any thing from Mr. *Bayly* in answer to it, *Anno* 1649. I sent a letter to you to intreate a word from you, what became of that letter with directions to what place in *London* your letter might be sent for me; of which likewise I have heard nothing. Forasmuch as without publishing something a blot indelible may lie on me and (which is more) on the truth I assert for my sake, and that in after ages when Mr. *Bayly's* book shall be read, and those false criminations found therein without any Vindication of mine, and I perceive by experience that such false reports as have been vented in Mr. *Edwards* his *Gangræna* (upon whose credit *Honorius Reggius* hath blazed them in a Latin writing) and in Mr. *Bayly's* Dissuasives have made many men undeservedly odious, and such reports vented in pulpits upon their credit have been the bellowes that did blow the fire of warre, which hath to the rejoicing of Malignants and grief of godly persons wasted your and our Countrey, and Mr. *Cotton* of N. E. thought meet to print an Apology for himself and the Churches there to vindecate himself from Mr. *Bayly's* aspersions in one part of his dissuasive, I have thought it necessary to vindicate my self in this, and have sent it to you, being one that I conceive cordially affected with the breaches that are among the Godly & studious of truth and peace, that you may impart this as you may opportunely to some Synod in your Countrey, and indeavour, as conscience and Covenant I think bind you, in the most prudent way you can to take of the injury of Mr *Bayly*; and which is the chief thing I aim at and humbly desire, that there may be some Course taken effectually to prevent such injurious misrepresentations of mens tenents, and practises in pulpits and presses, that so (if the Lord shall vouchsafe such a mercy) dissenters at last may in a calme and amicable way debate differences to the healing of our breaches: which is the prayer and aime of

Your Fellow-Servant and
Brother in Christ,
JOHN TOMBES.

Lemster in Herefordshire Decem. 4. 1651.

The Contents.

Sect. 1. *Of the* first Crimination, *That I spoile all infants of all interest in the Covenant of Grace.*

Sect. 2. *Of the* second Crimination, *That I make Circumcision to the Jewes a seale only of earthly and temporall privileges.*

Sect. 3. *Of the* third Crimination, *That I deny to the Jewish infants all right to the New Covenant, till they become actuall believers, from whence occasion is taken to shew the insufficiency of Mr.* Gerees *shift in expounding the words of the* Directory [the promise is made to believers and their seed,] *and the insufficiency of Mr.* Marshals *proof, of Connexion between the seal and the Covenant, from Gods institution; and Mr.* Bailies from the *nature of the terms.*

Sect. 4. *Of the* fourth Crimination, *That I give a power to unbaptized persons to baptize others.*

Sect. 5. *Of the* fifth Crimination, *That I make Apologies for the worst of the Anabaptists.*

Sect. 6. *Of the* sixth Crimination, *Inveighing against the first Reformers.*

Sect. 7. *Of the* seventh Crimination, *Inveighing against the Assembly at Westminster.*

Sect. 8. *Of the* eighth Crimination, *Inveighing against the Church of* Scotland.

Sect. 9. *Of the* nineth Crimination, *Inveighing against Mr.* Marshall.

Sect. 10. *Of the* tenth Crimination, *Of inveighing against Mr.* Thomas Goodwin.

Sect. 11. *Of the* eleventh Crimination, *Of Invectives against others.*

Sect. 12. *Of the* twelfth Crimination, *That I esteem baptisme an unnessary rite.*

Sect. 13. *Of the* thirteenth Crimination, *That I am carelesse of my own baptism.*

Sect. 14. *Of the* fourteenth Crimination, *That I am unwilling to joine with any of the Anabaptists Churches, and they unwilling to baptize non-members.*

Sect.

Sect. 15. *Of the* fifteenth Crimination, *My allowing frequent rebaptization.*

Sect. 16. *Of the* sixteenth Crimination, *That I make it Lawfull for persons unbaptized to partake of the Lords Supper.*

Sect. 17. *Of the* seventeenth Crimination, *That I am a Compleat* Erastian, *wherein reason is given of my doubt, that in Scripture no such juridicial Excommunication is appointed as is now contended for.*

Sect. 18. *Of the* eighteenth Crimination, *That I avow, no scandalous professor ought to be kept from the Lords Table.*

Sect. 19. *Of the* nineteenth Crimination *of me, That I hold no censure of excommunication.*

Sect. 20. *Of the* twentieth Crimination, *That I hold Christ hath not appointed any particular government for his Church.*

Sect. 21. *Of the* one and twentieth Crimination, *That I hold that the Government of the Church belongs to the Magistrate only.*

Sect. 22. *Of my new way, and boldnesse.*

Sect. 23. *Of my silence concerning* DIPPING, *and of the novelty and insufficiency of* SPRINKLING, *instead of* BAPTIZING.

Sect. 24. *The Conclusion, requiring reparation of the wrong done to me by Mr.* Bayly.

To the reverend and worthy Master ROBERT BAYLIE, *Minister at* GLASGOW in SCOTLAND.

SIR,

IN your Book intituled ANABAPTISM I, you charge me falsly in these following *Accusations chap.* 4. *page* 92. you say, *in these following things he flies as high, as any civil and discreet Anabaptist I have met with.*

1. *In spoyling Christian infants not only of Baptisme, but of all interest in the Covenant of Grace.* And in the *margine*, and *Table* in the end of your book, you say, *He spoyles all infants of all interest in the Covenant of Grace.*

2. *In making Circumcision a seal to the Jews onely of earthly and temporal priviledges.*

3. *In denying to Jewish infants all right to the new Covenant, till in their riper years they become actuall believers.*

SECT I.

Of the first Crimination, *that I spoile all Infants of all interest in the Covenant of Grace.*

TO prove these *accusations* which you so expresly charge me with, and tend to make your adversary odious, (which it seems you made

your businesse, and not to clear truth ;) you referre the Reader to the letters *A A page* 110. where you cite one passage of my *Apology page* 64. which doeth directly deny the *first accusation*, and where the passage of Mr. *Marshall* you alledge for proof of it,(a most unreasonable way to prove a mans position by his Antagonists conceit of it, as, that *Calvin made God the author of sin*, because *Bellarmin* accused him of it,)is sufficiently answered: yea in my *Post-script to Mr.* Blake in the end of my *Apology Sect.*22. I charge Master *Blake* of unjust crimination of me in this, and challenge Mr. *Marshall*, Mr. *Vines*, Mr. *Calamy*, and now your self to make good that charge if you can. And yet you are not asham'd to say, *pag.* 113. *All our adversaries deny to all infants all right in God, all interests in his promises, and Covenant, as much as they do to Turks, and Pagans.* And *chap.*4. *page* 89,90. after you had charged this accusation on others; in the close you say, *This makes them uncertain what to say of infants dying before conversion. Some save them all*, (which is contrary to what you say *page* 133;) *others incline to the damnation of them all; others professe the uncertainty of the thing, whether infants before their conversion be within the Kingdoms of Satan, or that of God.* And for proof of this last you referre the Reader to the letter *K*; and there you alledge my words in my *Apology page* 64,66. which speak not at all of the uncertainty of the thing you were speaking of, to wit, *the salvation or damnation of infants dying before conversion*, but the contrary, saying expresly, That every infant is either in the visible Kingdome of *God*, or of *Satan*, that is, elect, or reprobate. And for the certainty of the subject, I conceive neither you nor I, nor any on earth are certain what child of a Believer is elect, or reprobate. Sure I am Mr. *Marshall* in his Sermon *page* 48 saith, *Charity is not tyed to conclude certainly of any of them*, although in the beginning of his Sermon *page* 7. he would ground the salvation of all the infants of believers dying in their infancy, on Gods promise, *to be the God of Believers, and of their seed.* Besides, my words in my *Apology page* 64,66. which you alledge, speak onely of infants belonging visibly to the Kingdome of the Devil or God; and I still deny that they belong to either visibly, untill they make their profession, according to the constitution of the visible Church of Christians, which it behoved you to disprove, and not to misreport my words as you do.

SECT. II.

Of the second Crimination, *that I make Circumcision to the Jewes, a Seal onely of earthly and temporall priviledges.*

AS for your *second accusation*, you bring onely Mr. *Marshals* words which onely declare his suspicion; yet so unreasonable and groundless, as one might wonder any man should have the face to draw me into a suspicion of that, the contrary whereof is delivered in my *Exercitation page* 2. and very often in my *Exercitation* and *Examen of his Sermon*; in which I still make the Covenant made with *Abraham Gen.*17. which Circumcision confirmed, to be a *mixt Covenant, containing both spirituall and temporal promises*. And yet you expressly accuse me of the contrary; & against my plain words prove your charge, onely by Master *Marshals* suspition expressed in this manner; *What your meaning is in this expression, I cannot tell; it hath an untoward look, as if the meaning were*, &c. which was unreasonable in him to raise such a jealousie of me for citing onely a passage in that so approved Treatise of *Cameron* that learned Scot, *de triplici fœdere, th.* 78. (which was also much approved at *Heidelberg*) by the publisher of his works according to an order in a *Synod* of the *French* Churches; as to be stiled in *Cameron's Icon, accurratissimâ theses*; and they are now translated into English by Mr. *Samuel Bolton*, and printed at the end of his treatise, *of the true bounds of Christian freedom* with this commendation (*too precious to be any longer concealed, or hid under the shell of an unknown tongue.*) And yet these words were cited by me so warily *page* 4. of my *Exercitation* as that I say, *and if we may believe Mr.* Cameron; yet Mr. *Marshall* had so much ingenuity, as to say of me in that place *page.* 98. of his Defence, *It is too grosse a thing to imagine of God, and so expresly contrary to the word, that untill you own it, I will not impute it to you*: which words you leave out in your allegation against me from Mr. *Marshall*, whether needlesly or fraudulently, I leave it to your own conscience to consider.

SECT. III.

Of the third crimination, *That I deny to the Jewish infants all right to the new Covenant till they become actuall believers, from whence occasion is taken to shew the insufficiency of Mr.* Gerees *shift in expounding the words of the Directory* [*the promise is made to believers and their seed*] *And the insufficiency of Mr.* Marshals *proof of Connexion between the seal and Covenant from God's institution, and Mr.* Baylies *from the nature of the termes.*

AS for the *third accusation*, you bring not a word to prove it, yet you often charge sometimes all your adversaries, as in *chap.* 5. *pag.* 133. sometimes the principall of them (among whom I assure my self, you reckon me) with it, as when you say, *pag.* 151. *ch.* 5. *The ground of this reason is granted by the Principal of our adversaries, who avow their exclusion of infants from baptisme upon this ground mainely, that they believe they are excluded from the Covenant of Grace, remission of sins, the saving grace of the Spirit, till in the years of discretion they be brought actually to believe*, which thing I do expressly deny in my *Exercitation* pa. 24. with abhorrency from it, and *Examen* page 150. and page 109. I say, it were *a madnesse to go about to put them out of the Covenant of Grace.* You are often told in my *Examen* as page 29, 38, 110, 154. and many more places, that I avow exclusion of infants from baptism upon this ground mainly, that there is no Institution of it gathered by precept or Apostolical example, and therefore it is will-worship: As for a command of Circumcision I conceive it is abrogated, and so can be no rule now about Baptism; and the maintaining that a command of Circumcision still binds us (as Mr. *Marshall* doth in his *Sermon* page 35, 36, 37.) is the most manifest heresie of any, as being condemned in the first *Counsel* by the Apostles, *Acts* 15. 28. & 21. 25. Indeed to shew the weaknesse of Mr. *Marshalls* argument thus framed, *The infants of believing parents are within the Covenant of Grace, therefore they are to partake of the seale of the Covenant*, which in Mr. *Marshals* language is all one with baptisme: I did say that I did conceive the antecedent of his *Enthymeme* not true, *Examen* Part 3.

Sect.

Sect. 1. page 39. conceiving that as your practise is, so Mr. *Marshall* intended to defend this conclusion; All the infants born of a believer by profession are to be baptized according to ordinary rule, and so I expressed my selfe in my *Examen* Part 3. Sect. 15. *Exercit.* page 1. and elsewhere, and then his antecedent must be thus, *All the infants born of a believer are within the Covenant of grace*, or else his argument is manifestly inconcludent; if we would prove, all infants of believers are to be baptized, because some onely are in the Covenant of grace. Now I know not how to conceive that Mr. *Marshall* meant any other, then the Covenant of saving grace (of which I have given reasons not yet answered by Mr. *Marshall*, in my *Examen* page 45. and could adde more if it were needful) and that the believers infants were in the covenant of saving grace in that God hath made that promise to them. And in this sense I denied this proposition, *All the infants of a believer are within the Covenant of Grace*, and disproved it so fully in my *Examen* part 3. Sect. 4. that Mr. *Marshall* renounceth that proposition in that sense page 116. of his *Defence*, and then betakes himself to this shift, to understand it of the *outward covenant* as he calls it, in which sense I have proved in my *Apology* Sect. 10. his first argument to be meer trifling, and his speeches to be full of equivocation, or ambiguity, which I have also further proved in my *Postscript* in answer to Mr. *Ball* Sect. 6. Mr. *Geree* being inforced to deny that proposition in that sense, and being pressed by me with the words of the *Directory*, [*that the promise is made to believers and their seed*] he shifted it off in his *Vindiciæ pædobaptismi* page 13. by interpreting the words of the *Directory* thus, *This is to be presumed by men out of charity, till they discover the contrary, that all the infants of believers have the inward graces of the Covenant*, which I proved could not be the sense of the words of the *Directory* in my *Apology* Sect. 9. especially from the term [*made*] which imports Gods act, not mans charitable presumption. Now what doth Mr. *Geree* reply hereto? In his *Vindiciæ Vindicarum* chap. 4. page 16. he alters the words of the *Directory* thus, *That the promise is to believers and their seed*, leaving out the word [*made*] upon which my argument rested, and then page 18. tells me, the *quary is in what sense and in what respect children of believers are said to be in the Covenant of Grace*, whereas the quarry is in what sense the *Directory* meant these words [*the promise is made to believers and their seed*] not in what sense either in *Gen.* 17. 7. or *Rom.* 9. 4. or *Acts* 3. 25. *Children of Believers are said to be in the Covenant of grace*. And whereas Mr. *Geree* in the same book cha. 10. page 41. complains of my words in the *Epistle Dedicatory* of my *Apology*, that the doctrine of

the

the *Directory* is disavowed by two of my most eminent Antagonists, meaning himself and Mr. *Marshall*, I have, and am further ready to justify that speech, and if *many of the Assembly have assured him in private, that they intended the expressions questioned by me in no other sense then he expounded them*, I would have them know, that either they must alter the words as Mr. *Geree* doth, not reading them as they are printed, and as Mr. *Marshall* in his *Defence* page 116. Mr. *Geree Vindic. Pædobapt.* page 13. reads them, or else those *Assembly*-men must make a new Dictionary for us to understand their language by afore any man that understands common *English* will understand them so. And whereas he *would have by this one Examination men judge of all the rest*, I am contented with it, provided that men by his superficial and shifting dealing in this judge of all the rest. But to retume, as I denyed the antecedent in Mr. *Marshalls Enthymeme*, so I denied the consequence page 36. and *did more then make some velitation*, I proved by a just dispute that the proposition is not true, *All that are in the Covenant of Grace must be sealed*, and though Mr. *Marshall* page 92. of *his Defence*, say somewhat to prove it from Gods will *Gen.* 17. 7, 9, 10, 14. yet what is said there is only of circumcision, nothing of baptisme, and the word [*therefore*] upon which Mr. *Marshalls* proof rests is in the *Hebrew* ואתה which may be and is translated otherwise, as by the *Tigurines Et tu* by *Parreus Tu autem*, by *Piscator Tu vero*, &c. and the proposition is manifestly false in Mr. *Marshalls* sense, yea he granted page 92, 182. that the *formal reason of their being circumcised was the command of God*, which I truely observed and proved in my *Apology in the Epistle Dedicatory and in the Apology it self* page 90. overthrows his argument from the Covenant to the seale, which rests on this, *that such as received the initial seal, received it because they were in the Covenant*, which are Mr. *Marshalls* words in his *Defence* page 92. you in your *Anabaptisme* chap. 5. page 132. say, *your proposition is grounded on the nature of the terms*, which you never go about to prove but *dictate* thus: *The Major*, [*Whoever have right to the chief promises of the New Testament, they have right to the first Sacrament of the New Testament, if the Lord have not put some impediment to their participation of that Sacrament*] *is grounded on the nature of the terms of the proposition the chief promises of the New Testament, and the first Sacrament, this is the sign and seal, that the thing signified. The reason proceeds not from every thing signified to every sign but from the chief thing signified to the first signe.*

Give me leave to tell you that I seldome meet with a passage that hath

hath more absurdity then this of yours. 1. You set not down right the terms of your own proposition, which are not [*the chief promises of the New Testament, and the First Sacrament*] but [*having right to the chief promises of the New Testament, and having right to the First Sacrament, if the Lord have not put some impediment to their participation of that Sacrament*] as if you had forgotten so soon or could not analyse your own proposition. 2. You tell us [this is the sign and seale, that the thing signified] as if this were the nature of the terms. But what an illogical conceit is this? Logicians call a reason from the nature of the terms, when the terms are included, the one *in Conceptu quidditativo alterius*, so as that the one cannot be conceived without the other. Now may not the chief promises of the New Testament be conceived without the first sign and seale? Did not God make the chief promises of the New and Old Testament before ever any sign or seale was appointed, much more before baptisme? Did not God make the chief promise πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων *Tit.* 1. 2. which we translate *before the world began*, most rightly as I conceive Dr. *Twisse Vindic. grat. lib.* 1. *par.* 1. *dig.* 2. *cap.* 5. referres to that in paradise *Gen* 3. 15. your own Mr. *Dickson*, either to that or to Gods promise to Christ afore the world was made, all I meet with make it antecede any first signe or seal of the Old or New Testament? Now how is there a connexion between *terms from the nature of them*, whereof one may not only be conceived, but be also existent both *de facto* and *de iure* without the other? If the terms were [having the chief promises of the New Testament, and having the First Sacrament] yet there is no such connexion from the nature of the terms. Innumerable may have, and have the chief promises of the New Testament, that have not the first Sacrament, *et vice versa*. Else you must hold worse positions then the Papists that none but baptized persons have or can have the chief promises of the New Testament, and that every baptized person hath the chief promises of the New Testament. There is lesse connexion from the nature of the terms between the having right to the chief promises of the New Testament, & having right to the First Sacrament of the New Testament. For if you meane it of right before God, thousands may have right in Gods election and covenant with Christ, that are not in being, that are in their mothers womb, that are yet among infidels uncalled: have these right to the First Sacrament? If you mean it of right *in facie Ecclesiæ* onely, then I grant the proposition is true: but your Minor hath clean another sense then your words and proofs import you conceived of it: however this right comes meerly from Gods institution, which is to be the rule of the Churches judging and administrators action,

and

and that is not from the right to the chief promises, but from profession of faith arising from Gods will not the nature of the terms. There is no essential connexion between them *constitutive* or *consecutive*, neither is one of the definition or essential property to the other: and God hath much more plainly put a barre against infant-baptisme then infant-communion, not only in that there is neither expresse precept nor example for it in Scripture, but also the very institution excludes them, appointing it only to disciples *Mat.* 28. 19. putting believing before baptisme *Mark* 16. 16. & in practise requiring it *Act.* 8. 37. besides the image of it in all ages of the Church requiring profession of faith of some for them even in the baptisme of infants. But you shew the nature of the terms in these words, *This is the sign and seal, that the thing signified.* By your Logick then if the chief promises of the New Testament be to be defined you would define them to be the thing signified by the first Sacrament of the New Testament: which were to define *ignotum per ignotius*, and by that which is meerly extrinsecal to it. A promise is an action: the thing signified by the first Sacrament is not only something to come but also something past as the death, burial, resurrection of Christ in baptisme *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. *Col.* 2. 12. the thing promised is something we are to have, the promise is Gods act, the first Sacrament the administrators act. How inept a definition is such a definition in which the *genus* doth not *praedicari in quid* on the *definitum*, nor the whole definition is reciprocal with the *definitum*, besides other defects? But it maybe you meant that it is of the nature of the first Sacrament to be a sign and seale of the chief promises of the New Testament. Were this so, you should not rightly argue: for then the right to the promises should be derived from the seal, not to the seale from the promise, if the promise be of the nature of the seale, and not *e contra*: whereas you say that *your reason proceeds from the chief thing signifyed to the first sign.* But how can you or any make this good that it is the nature of the first Sacrament only (for you exclude the second expressely after in these words, *nor do we speak but of the first sign*) to be a signe and seale of the chief promises of the New Testament? Is not the second sign as wel a sign and seal of them as the first? Besides what is the term [seale] there but a Metaphor? And is it not absurd to make a Metaphor of the nature of a term, which doeth not shew what a thing is but what it is like, contrary to the rule of Logicians? *Scheibler. Top. ca.* 30. *num.* 126. *Definitio non fit ex verbis Metaphoricis. Ita Aristot. Top. Lib.* 2. *cap.* 2. *Sect.* 4 *Keckerm Syst. Logic. Lib.* 1. *Sect.* 2. *cap.* 2. &c. Yet how absurdly is a seale of the Covenant made the *Genus* in the definition of a

Sa-

ſacrament being but a Metaphor, and books and Sermons ſtuffed with collections of duties and priviledges about the Sacraments from a meer Metaphor? A thing I am aſſured worthy Lamentation when I conſider the trouble it hath brought to many conſciences, and diſquiet in the Church. But were it granted that the term, ſigne or ſeal were of the nature of the firſt Sacrament, how doth it appear that it is the nature of the Sacrament to ſignifie Gods promiſe to us rather then our promiſe to God? Though I deny not but baptiſme ſignifies and in a ſenſe ſeales Gods promiſes to us, as may be ſeen in my former writings, yet ſo farre as I am able to diſcern the chief and primary uſe is to ſignifie our profeſſion and promiſe to God, and therefore it is required as our act and duty, and therein we are ſaid to put on Chriſt. And why then ſhould we not rather ſay, that it is the nature of baptiſme to be a ſign or ſeale of our profeſſion, and then we have a better argument from the nature as you ſpeak, from the uſe, as I would ſpeak, of the firſt Sacrament to prove that infants are not to be baptized, then that they are. The trueth is Sacraments are not ſignes natural but poſitive, and ſo have no nature to ſign or ſeale but by inſtitution, and therefore there's no connexion, or right between the Covenant and ſeal, as they ſpeak, from the nature of the terms, but by Gods inſtitution. And therefore Mr. *Marſhall* did more conſiderately aſcribe it to Gods will, then you do to deriue it from the nature of the terms, you miſcarry as much in that which followes when you ſay, *The reaſon proceeds not from every thing ſignified to every ſign, but from the chief thing ſignified to the firſt ſign:* yet before you expreſſed the nature of the terms thus, *The one is the ſign, the other the thing ſignified*, and you give no reaſon why there ſhould be more connexion between the chief things ſignified, and the firſt ſign, then the not chief things ſignified, and the ſecond, nor do I know by what rule you proceed in making ſome promiſes of the New Teſtament chief, and ſome not: It follows, *Some of the bleſſings which Circumciſion did ſeal belonged to Melchizedeck, to Lot, to Job, and others who were not ſo farre as we reade circumciſed, but the main promiſe ſealed by Circumciſion, In thy ſeed all the nations of the earth ſhall be bleſſed, The Meſſias comming of the poſterity of Abraham, Iſaac and Jacob, the Covenant of Grace as it was adminiſtred under the figure of the Ceremoniall Law did belong to the people of Iſrael alone, and to the proſelytes who joined themſelves to their body*. You intimate truly that the reaſon of circumciſing infants was not taken from the common right of believers to the Covenant of Grace, but from the end God had in ſignifying Chriſt to come of *Abraham*, which is a good evidence that baptizing infants now hath not the ſame reaſon that

circumcising of infants had ther, and so all your argument from the analogy between Infant-Baptisme and Infant-Circumcision from the like reason of both falls to the ground: But sure the main promise of the New Testament did belong to *Melchizedec*, *Lot* and *Job* as much as to believers now, and if righteousnesse by faith be sealed by circumcision, as you expressely teach page 141. from *Rom.* 4. 11. then the main promise sealed by Circumcision belonged to *Melchizedec*, *Lot* and *Job*, and so if there be such a connexion between the chief promise and the first seale they should have been circumcised as well as the Jewes: and it is as strange to me how you can make the promise of the Messias comming from *Abraham* belonging to proselytes more then to them. But this is enough to give a taste of your manner of disputing. But I must follow you, you go on.

SECT. IV.

Of the fourth Crimination, *that I give a power to unbaptized persons to baptize others.*

IN giving a power to unbaptized persons to baptize others. For proof of this you referre the Reader to the letters B B page 111. and there I find one passage of Mr. *Marshalls*, which only declares his own conceit, and one passage of mine from my *Apology* page 54. which speaks not at all of that point, but of another, whether in any case an unbaptized person may receive the Lords Supper. As for that you charge me with, I remember not where I have spoken to it in my printed writings. But for the thing it self. If no continuance of adult-baptisme can be proved, and baptisme by such baptized persons is wanting, yet I conceive, what many Protestant writers do yield, when they are pressed by the Papists to shew the calling of the first reformers, That after an universal corruption the necessity of the thing doth justify the persons that reforme though wanting an ordinary, regular calling (which thing I find fully avouched by the Ministers sent to *Oxford* in their *Account given to the Parliament* page 28, 29.) will justify in such a case both the lawfulnesse of a Ministers baptizing, that hath not been rightly baptized himself, and the sufficiency of that baptisme to the person so baptized. And this very thing, that

Vide Anſ. of the Elders of New Engl to 32 que. q 21. p 72, 73, 74. all in defe of anſw. 109 to 1st. page 156.

that in a case where a baptized Minister cannot be had, it is lawfull for an unbaptized person to baptize, and his baptisme is valid, is both the resolution of *Aquinas parte 3. q. 67. art. 5.* and *Zanchius* an eminent Protestant *Comment. in Ephes. 5. 26. Loc. 2. part. 2. cap. 4. num. 21. quaritur an is possit baptizare eos quos ad Christum convertit, cum ipse nunquam fuerit baptizatus baptismo aquæ? non dubito quin possit, & vicissim curare, ut ipse ab alio ex illis a se conversis baptizetur. Ratio est: quia minister est verbi, à Christo extraordinem excitatus: eoq; ut talis minister, potest cum illius Ecclesiolæ consensu, synmistam constituere, & ab eo ut baptizetur curare.* Whereby you may perceive that this is no new truth, that an unbaptized person may in some case baptize another, and he baptize him being baptized of him. And if you hold it so hainous a position, you might do well to answer Mr. *Spilsbery* his reasons in his book intituled *The Saints interest*, chiefly page 10. which book you cite in the third and fourth chapters of your ANABAPTISME, though in your third chapter you mistake, in alledging words as Mr. *Spilsbery's*, which are in the preface to the book made by Mr. *Cox*.

SECT. V.

Of the fifth Crimination, *that I make Apologies for the worst of the Anabaptists.*

IN making Apologies for the worst of the Anabaptists even those of Munster. And in the *margin* and the *table* in the end of your book, you say of me, *He is a friend to the worst Anabaptists, and injurious to all who oppose them.* And for proofe of this you referre the reader to the letters C C, where is one passage cited out of my *Apology* page 31. which hath not a word of *Apology* or friendship for, or towards any of the evil practises of the *Anabaptists*; but you might have read in the next page before, a professed abhorring of their wicked practises, and judging them worse in them, then they would be in others not so baptized. As for the words you alledge, they contain onely a declaration of my suspension of my judgement concerning some things related of them for reasons there alledged. In which suspension I am the more confirmed by your palpably unrighteous, if not malicious dealing with me in these accusations. And

I conceive your, Mr. *Marshal's*, and other *Pædobaptists* dealing in mis-reporting of me and others will better serve for their *Apology*, then my words. 'Tis true, I endeavour to remove that prejudice against the truth of *Anti-pædobaptisme*, which your, and other mens bitter writings and preachings create to it in your charging the miscarriages of *Muncer*, and at *Munster* and some others upon the doctrine it self, never considering that now for a long time no such miscarriages are charged upon them justly, they live as peaceably as other men, their doctrine disclaimes them, the like miscarriages have been in removing other evils that are confessed to be such, as in the *Iconoclasts*, *Antiprelatists*, &c. which you would think it to be unrighteous to charge on those that have sought the removing of Images, prelacy and ceremonies. Why then do you deale so unjustly with others, forgetting that golden rule of Christ *Mat.* 7. 12. *Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do you even so to them: for this is the Law and the Prophets?*

Whereto let me adde that reading lately in *Grimstones General History of the Netherlands lib.* 9. *pag.* 442. that the *inquisition of Spain* advised the *King of Spain* in these words *art.* 7. *They shall hire at our charge thieves and spoylers of Churches and images, whose offences shall be by all the world imputed to the rebells, by some subtil meanes, and so we shall vanquish them.* I conceived my speech in my *Apology* page 31. (which you interpret as very hainous) considerately, when I said, *I do count the story of the Anabaptists to contain in it many things, the true reasons of which, and the true knowledge of the circumstances concerning them will not appear till the day of the revelation of the righteous judgement of God.* And I confesse it makes me somewhat suspicious that in these daies by *Jesuiticall Emissaries* horrid opinions, and unruly practises are vented; and attempted to make the party that are for reformation, and truth at this day odious to the world.

SECT. VI.

Of the sixth Crimination *inveighing against the first reformers.*

AND *invectives against the best that oppose them; the first reformers.* For proof hereof you referre the Reader to the letters D D page 111. where

where is alledged one paſſage of my *Apology* in page 32. which hath not a word of invectiveneſſe againſt *the firſt reformers*, much leſſe any invective *againſt the beſt that oppoſed the Anabaptiſts at Munſter*, but only in as mild an expreſſion as I could deſire, a declaration of my opinion, that the reformed Churches have beene to blame that they never yielded to reforme *Pædobaptiſme* in a regular way. Will not you ſay the *Saxon* Churches have been to blame in not taking away of Images out of Churches, the *Engliſh* Churches in not removing Prelacy and ceremonies? yet you would think he wronged you, that ſhould ſay, that in that ſpeech you made an invective againſt thoſe Churches. Yet this is your dealing with me.

SECT. VII.

Of the ſeventh Crimination *inveighing againſt the Aſſembly at Weſtminſter.*

THe Aſſembly at Weſtminſter. For proof hereof you referre the Reader to the letters E E page 111. where is cited one paſſage out of my *Apology* page 106. which hath not a word of exception againſt any man, much leſſe of invectiveneſſe againſt the *Aſſembly at Weſtminſter*: only it contains the expreſſion of my belief that the ableſt of the *Aſſembly* contrived Mr. *Marſhalls* book, and my wiſh, that it were declared whether the *Pædobaptiſts* would ſtick to it or any other work: which I conceive a reaſonable wiſh, finding the *Proteus*-like inconſtancy of *Pædobaptiſts* in many points of the diſpute between us, particularly in the chief argument from circumciſion and the covenant *Gen.* 17. to infant-baptiſm, one forming the argument one way, another another way, one deriving the connexion between the Covenant and initial ſeal from the nature of the terms, another from Gods will, one aſcribing an intereſt in the outward Covenant only to all infants of believers, another aſcribing an intereſt to them in the inward Covenant alſo according to charitable preſumption, another conditionally, another aſſerting the Covenant of Grace to belong to them for the moſt part, one grounding infant-baptiſme on the judgement of charity, another denying that ſufficient: and requiring a judgement of faith, one ſtating the queſtion concerning all infants of believers, another con--

concerning some only, one interpreting 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. of federal holinesse, another of real holinesse, one waving the argument from succession of baptisme to circumcision, another avouching it, with many other differences, which tend to the wearying of a disputant and the eading of a Reader that desires to find truth, and to spend time in examining what is fixed, not to lose it in disputing against that which one will own, but it may be most will disclaim. What the *Assembly* have done in this matter doth not yet answer this wish. What is said in the *Directory*, it may be well doubted whether *Assembly*-men now hold, by that which hath passed between me and Mr. *Marshal* and Mr. *Geree*, about the proposition, [*the promise is made to believers and their seed*,] what is said in their *advice concerning a confession of faith* Ch. 28. Art. 4. is so farre from satisfying, that it is yet a riddle to me how infant-baptisme can be drawn from *Gen.* 17. 7, 9. with *Gal.* 3. 9, 14. which I remember not alledged by any *Pædobaptists* since I entered on the dispute, save what I heard from Mr. *Herle* now the *Prolocutor*; (which I mention in my *Apology* page 41.) which he did with so little evidence for his purpose, as I supposed it had been his own peculiar conceit, not the *Assemblies* argument. And for the rest of the texts, if the *Assembly* can say any more then Mr. *Marshall* and others have said for deducing of *Pædobaptisme* out of them, it were fit it should be known, if not, I for my part count my self as much unsatisfyed by the *Assemblies* alledging impertinent texts, as by a private mans doing the same. This I declare to give the reason of that speech of mine in my *Apology*. As for the *Assembly* though I have expressed my jealousie of some defects in them, and perhaps shall not agree with them in all their determinations, yet I have cast no filth in their faces, as Mr. *Marshall* injuriously accused me, even for my good will to them; but have done and spoken respectively of them, as *Examen* page 1. studying what I could to prevent those blemishes in their proceedings and determinations, which will in time more appear then yet they do, and am induced to believe that there are so many of them therein that know me so well, as that they would be loath to disclaim me, whatever they do of my opinion. And though Mr. *Payne* in his *Suspension Suspended* page 21. saith, *Mr. Marshalls solution is approved by the Assembly*, and so takes his book to be approved by them; and you count my words of that book to be an invective against the *Assembly*: yet I do not take it to be approved by the *Assembly* till they declare it to be so, though I have reason to conceive, that divers of the ablest of the *Assembly*, especially in some part of learning, had their hand in it.

Sect.

SECT. VIII.

Of the eighth Crimination *inveighing againſt the Church of* Scotland.

The Church of Scotland. For proofe of this you refere the Reader to the letters F F page 112. in which you cite one paſſage of my *Apology* page 93. which doth not ſo much as mention any Church, *much leſſe the Church of Scotland*, but onely the mannagers of the cenſure of juridical excommunication, whom however the *Papiſts* & *Prelates* uſe to ſpeak, I think you uſe not to call the Church of *Scotland*, nor do I. Nor is there a word of invectiveneſſe againſt any in thoſe wordes, but only a declaration, what I queſtion upon my beſt intelligence which had leſſe reference to *Scotland*, then to other parts of the world.

SECT. IX.

Of the nineth Crimination, *inveighing againſt Mr.* Marſhal.

MAſter MARSHAL. For proofe hereof you referre your Reader to the letters G G page 112. and there you cite two paſſages out of my APOLOGY: one of which page 57. is this. *I find the words of an intelligent man true concerning Mr.* Marſhal, *that he was apt to miſtake*, and in the other page 69. I ſay, *that I find him ſtill a confuſed diſputer*: which indeed containes ſome complaint of Mr. *Marſhal*, much leſſe then I had cauſe: but not any invective, which I take to be an oration againſt a man to make him odious, ſuch as *Tullies Philippicks* againſt *Antonius*, and *Demoſthenes* againſt *Philip*, and *Nazianzen* againſt *Julian.*

SECT. X.

Of the tenth Crimination, *of inveighing againſt Mr.* Tho. Goodwin.

MAſter *Goodwin*. For proofe here of you referre the Reader to the letters HH page 112. And there you cite two ſhreds of a large paſſage concerning an accuſation of Mr. *Marſhal*, in which he chargeth me as vilifying Mr. *Thomas Goodwin*, which charge I there anſwer, and then uſe ſome words which are not invective, but a declaration, what I conceived of his diſcourſe, which if it may not be allowed in diſpute the beſt writers among us will be condemned *Dr. Twiſſe*, Mr. *Gataker*, and your brethren Mr. *Rutherfurd*, Mr. *Gilleſpy*, your *ſelf*, and who not? your own words in the firſt part of your *Diſſuaſive* page 119. do come neerer to an invective againſt Mr. *Thomas Goodwin*, then any words in my *Apology* or *Examen*; the former of which the licenſer although Mr. *Goodwins* tender friend, yet judged *mild*.

SECT. XI.

Of the eleventh Crimination, *of invectives againſt others.*

AND *others*. For proof of this you referre the Reader to *H H* 2. page 112. where you cite two paſſages of my *Apology*, the one containing no accuſation, no nor ſo much as a complaint againſt any one, but onely a mention of my experiment, which I wiſh the caſe of *Doctor Twiſſe* (that I inſtance in no other) had not verified; the other paſſage is no invective againſt any but meerly an applying of Mr. *Ley's* words to my Treatiſe, which he had avowed of my Antagoniſts writings.

Sir, I ſuppoſe it would better have ſuited with charity, I living the laſt ſummer at the *Temple* not farre from you, if you had in a brotherly way minded me of my *flying high*, of my *incivility*, or *inadvertion*, that I might have ſeene your love in your reproof, afore I ſaw your accuſation to my diſgrace in print.

But

But you add more accuſations of me, and ſay. *But in thoſe thing he goes farre beyond all the Anabaptiſts I have met with.*

SECT. XII.

Of the twelfth Crimination, *that I eſteem baptiſme an unneceſſary rite.*

FIrſt he eſteems baptiſm ſo unneceſſary a rite that men who are meet to receive it may very well be without it, as *Conſtantine, Ambroſe and others did delay to their old age that Sacrament*. And in the margine, and table at the end of your book. *He makes baptiſme a rite needleſſe either to young or old*, and for proof whereof you referre the Reader to the letters I I page 112. and thoſe letters referre to B B *ſuprà*, where two paſſages are cited, one of Mr. *Marſhals*, which onely declares his own conceit about another point, that *ſuppoſing infant-baptiſme a nullity he cannot underſtand how any in the world ſhould this day be lawfully baptized*, and another paſſage out of my *Apology* page 54. which is cited by you maimedly as *Pſalm* 91. 11. was cited *Math.* 4. 6. leaving out five lines that come between [*perplexities*] and [*for beſides*] without any &c. perverting thereby the ſenſe, as if the words [*for beſides*, &c.] were a reaſon of that you cite before, whereas they are a reaſon of that which I expreſſe; but you leave out, *that I do not think an unbaptized perſon receiving the Lords Supper is either ſuch a new opinion or practiſe, as Mr.* Marſhall *made it.* And yet in the words as you cite them, there is no proof of that you charge me with. There is no mention at all of *Ambroſe*, and that which I mention of *Conſtantine* is done without any approbation. Nor will it follow from my determination, that becauſe I ſay, *if it be ſtood upon in point of conſcience, ſo as in no caſe an unbaptized perſon is to be permitted to partake of the Lords Supper, it will of neceſſity make many ſuperſtitious perplexities in Miniſters, and inferre many an unneceſſary ſchiſme*; therefore I eſteem baptiſme a needleſſe rite, that men who are meet to receive it may very well be without it. This argument (and ſuch I take your proof to be) I would ſay, if I may uſe that Schoole expreſſion any more, is *a baculo ad angulum*. And yet a man would think you had need of a ſtrong proof to make men believe that I hold baptiſme a needleſſe rite, who have ſuffered

and ſtill ſuffer very much for my oppoſing infant-baptiſme. But my words truly underſtood do inferre the contrary to that you charge me with, ſith they aſſert baptiſme afore the Lords ſupper neceſſary to be ſtood upon in point of prudence for right order, and intimate the like in point of conſcience except in ſome caſes. When I conſider this dealing with me I cannot gueſſe why you ſhould thus abuſe me in this ſo credible a thing, unleſſe you would ſlily inſinuate as if I were of the *Socinians* mind in this, and thereby help to loade me with the moſt unbrotherly charge of Socinianizing begun by Mr. *Marſhal* in the beginning of his *Defence*, for which the Lord forgive him and you.

SECT. XIII.

Of the thirteenth Crimination, *that I am careleſſe of my own baptiſme.*

AND it ſeems himſelf is careleſſe to be baptized to this day. For his infant-baptiſme according to his arguments muſt be null, & another baptiſm as yet it ſeems he hath not received. Here you accuſe me of careleſneſs of my own baptiſm. But, Sir, let me tell you, that unleſſe you knew it by my own confeſſion (which I am ſure you did not) you go beyond your line to judge my ſecret practiſes, yea my very thoughts, for careleſſenes is a privation of cares which are thoughts. You ſay, *I am a very bold man*, but you no where find in me ſuch boldneſſe as this to judge a mans thoughts. You might do well to remember what is ſaid *Mat.* 7. 1. *James* 3. 1. But for the thing you ſay, *my infant-baptiſme according to my arguments muſt be null, and as yet it ſeems I have not received another baptiſme.* Let it be granted *that my infant-baptiſme according to my arguments muſt be null*, that is as I underſtand inſufficient for the doing of the duty of being baptized according to Chriſts appointment (which yet you have not ſo much as attempted to prove) and that I have not yet received another baptiſm, how doth this prove my careleſſeneſſe of mine own baptiſme? For if it were true indeed that according to my arguments my infant-baptiſme were null, yet if it did not ſo appear to me (as I confeſſe I was once doubtful, as my words *Exercit.* pag. 22. ſhew, conceiving the maine uſe of baptiſme being a confirming of my profeſſion of Chriſt, by that right an after profeſſion might ratify a former baptiſme though not every way right, though I dare not reſt upon that conceit) and therefore I did not receive another

other baptiſme, that would prove I was not altogether careleſſe of my own baptiſme. But what? if I did conceive my infant-baptiſme a nullity, and yet doubted whether any could now be rightly baptized, becauſe no unbaptized perſon can give baptiſm, as Mr. *Marſhall* profeſſeth in his *Defence* page 245. or becauſe none can now give the ſpirit, and therefore received not baptiſme yet, this might free me from your charge of careleſneſſe of my own baptiſme. Again if I were reſolved that right baptiſm might be had notwithſtanding theſe doubts, and were reſolved to receive it, but either waited to ſee what the *Aſſembly* would do about examining the point of *Pædobaptiſme*, or the Churches of *New England*, or how I might do my duty to Chriſt with leaſt offence to the State, or to my brethren in the Miniſtery, and with moſt ſatisfaction to my own conſcience concerning the adminiſtrator, adminiſtration and other circumſtances about it, I might be rather over-careful then careleſſe of my own baptiſm for ought you knew to the contrary, and conſequently your accuſation of me might be (as it was) both raſh and falſe. Will you ſay the Miniſters about *London*, that have differred adminſtring the Lords Supper for many years for want of ſettled diſcipline are careleſſe of the Lords Supper? and yet were not you partial I were more excuſable in my action about this thing. But I hope your accuſation of me ſhall do me ſo much good, as to quicken me to a more ſpedy reſolution what to do in this great buſineſſe, though I confeſſe my over-tenderneſſe to give offence to my brethren in the Miniſtery who have ſhewed little or no tender regard of me, but rather have ſet themſelves to make me odious, to keep me under in my credit and eſtate, and (which is exceſſive impiety) to hinder me in the work of my Miniſtery of the Goſpel, hath made me ſomewhat the ſlacker in reſolving and accompliſhing what is my duty in this thing.

SECT. XIV.

Of the fourteenth Crimination, *That I am unwilling to join with any of the Anabaptiſts Churches, and they unwilling to baptize non-members.*

FOr he profeſſeth an unwillingneſſe to ioine himſelf as a member to any of the Anobaptiſts Churches, and I ſuppoſe they are unwilling to bap-

tize any, who will not joine in Communion with them. And for proof of the former you referre the Reader to the letters K K page 112. at which you cite (not as they are in my book) some words of my *Apology* page 10. which neither as they are in mine, or your book do prove my unwillingnesse to joine my self as a member to any of the Anabaptists Churches. For a man may be willing to joine himself as a Member to any of the Anabaptists Churches, *and yet not dare to gather a separated Church*, not every one who joins as a member with a separated Church being guilty of a schisme, which a gatherer of a separated Church may be guilty of. Besides a man may not know how to justify at one time the practise of gathering a separated Church or joining with it, who may know how to justify it at another time, when there is no hope of reformation, and men are judged hereticks, and excommunicated for holding truth and doing their duty. The seven dissenting brethren in the *Assembly* had subscribed with fourteen more of the ablest of the *Assembly to certain considerations to dissuade from further gathering of Churches in that present juncture of time*, to which my words you cite had reference, who it may be now would not dissuade from gathering Churches. But the truth is my not daring to gather a separated Church then was my willingnesse to join with any Churches of Christ (and I think as much ill will as you bear to them, yet you will not dare to say, that none of the Anabaptists Churches are Churches of Christ) though I was not willing to be a separating member in any Church but willing to be a conjoined member with all the Churches of Christ in general, and each in particular: So farre is your allegation from proving what you charge me with that it proves the contrary. And for that you say, *that you suppose the Anabaptists Churches are unwilling to baptize any who will not joine in communion with them*, if you meane thus, they will not baptize any who will not joine in Communion with them as fixed members entring into the Covenant called *Church-Covenant*, and professing the way of discipline called the *Congregational way* as the only way, and separating from any Church of Christ that is in any other way of discipline (for not doing which it seems you conceive them unwilling to admit me to baptisme) I have cause to think you are mistaken. For having upon occasion of these your words written to an Elder of one of their Churches intreating him to consult with some others, and to give me resolution in these questions.

1. *What joining in Communion do you require without which you will not baptize any?*

2. *Whether on my profession of my repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus,*

ſus, and readineſſe to hold communion with all the Churches of Chriſt in the things of Chriſt, though I do not promiſe to be a fixed member in any of their Congregations, you would admit me to baptiſme? I received this following anſwer ſubſcribed by three graduates in ſchooles, godly and learned men in theſe words:

That which we require and without which we will not baptize any is a perſons manifeſtation of himſelfe to be a believer in Jeſus Chriſt, and to deſire baptiſme according to the revealed will of Chriſt, and in obedience thereunto, we do not baptize any into this or that particular congregation: but only into that one body in general ſpoken of 1 Cor. 12. 13. *As touching joining in communion, we in this caſe require no more, then a manifeſt readineſſe to hold communion with all the Churches of Chriſt in the things of Chriſt, and accordingly to ſhew a real willingneſſe to have communion with any particular Church of Chriſt according as the hand of God ſhall give opportunity, and true ſeaſonableneſſe of and for the ſame. Thus we judge and practiſe accordingly.* Benjamen Cox.

Henry Jeſſe. Hanſerd Knollys.

I do teſtifie the ſubſtance hereof to be the profeſſed judgement of that congregation whereto I am joined, and alſo that congregation, where Mr. Kiffin, Patient, and Spilsbery are joined, who did affirm ſo much to be their own judgement alſo. The Scripture upon which we ſo practiſe is that Acts 8. 37, 38. Hanſerd Knollys.

SECT. XV.

Of the fifteenth Crimination, *of my allowing frequent rebaptization.*

SEcondly when a man is baptized according to his own minde, he allowes him to be oft thereafter rebaptized, even ſo oft as he repents for ſin, which by the godly is done (at the leaſt ought to be done) oftener then once. And in the margin and the table at the end of your book, *He allowes a frequent rebaptizing*: and for proof you referre your Reader to the letters L L page 112. and there you ſend your Reader back to the letter *C ſupra. Now after you had ſaid: but to put the equity of this reproof out of doubt, their great Patrons now are come to defend the lawfulneſſe*

of

of baptiſme not onely twice, but if ye will ten times; yea ſo oft as you repent for ſin, which ought to be oftner, then once a day. So of Anabaptiſts they become Hemerobaptiſts, and more, for proof of this you refer the Reader to the letter C, and there you alledge one paſſage in my *Examen* page 23. and another paſſage in my *Apology* page 53. and a relation of unnamed *Eminent Divines.*

It is true, that to ſhew the unreaſonable dealing of thoſe that made rebaptization an hereſie, *I did intreate one good argument to prove it unlawful* in ſe *for a man that hath been baptized righly to be baptized againe*, and to ſhew the weakneſſe of the arguments brought to prove it unlawful *in ſe* to rebaptize, I briefly anſwered the two chief, the latter wherof ſeems to be that upon which the *Aſſembly* reſted, in that they alledge, to prove this propoſition, *The Sacrament of baptiſme is but once to be adminiſtred to any perſon*, onely the text Tit. 3. 5. *where God is ſaid to ſave us by the waſhing of regeneration. Advice for confeſſion of faith*, chap. 28, *art.* 7. And then I added, *that if there were as good example for* Pædobaptiſme, *as that of* Acts 19. 5,6. *for rebaptizing, the controverſie concerning* Pædobaptiſme *were at an end with me.* In which paſſage I did not aſſert the proof to be good for rebaptizing; but compared with the proof for *Pædobaptiſme* to be better, that is more probable then the other, and ſuch as if I had had but the like for *Pædobaptiſme* I had not moved any more about it. Which I wrote, becauſe I knew that very many writers both antient and latter do very probably from expreſſe words in that place conceive, that *Paul* did rebaptize, whereas there is not any probability, that any infant was baptized by the Apoſtles; nor have the Antients (that I know) ever gone about to prove it from any example in the Acts of the Apoſtles but by tradition. But in all this I did not at all ſet down my judgement of the thing, whether rebaptizing were lawful or not, but onely queſtioned the proofes alledged to make it unlawful, whether they yielded good arguments. I know there was another argument from circumciſion but once: but I did not think that argument worth anſwering, nor do I yet, notwithſtanding Mr. *Marſhals* eſteem of it, nor it may ſeeme would the *Aſſembly* build on it by their omitting it in the place before quoted. I ſtill profeſſe, that I reject all arguments drawn ſince the Apoſtles from analogy of rites or cuſtomes of the *Jewes* in meer poſitive things ſo as to conclude thence any thing to bind us as *ure divino* by Gods appoinntment. And I conceive they ſerve for no better purpoſe, then to cauſe much wrangling, to fill people with ſuperſtitions, and to weary ſchollers, and that they better fit *Papiſts* and *Prelates* turns, then

Indepen-

Independents or Presbyterians. And I was sorry to reade in your brother *Gillespy* his *Aarons rod blossoming* book 1 cha. 3. page 15. *that from* 2 Chr. 19.8,10,11. *the reverend and learned Assembly of Divines have drawn an argument for ruling Elders*, hoping they would have discarded all such arguments. But I said also *Examen* page 84. *I conceive it true, that there is no necessity of administring either circumcision or baptism above once: but a demonstrative argument to prove it an heresie or unlawfull in it self to rebaptize I yet expect*. These passages Mr. *Marshall* page 67. of his *Defence* sayes, *do clearly discover my itch after new opinions*. But this was inconsiderately & uncharitably said, sith my words lead him [illegible]nother reason of those passages, though it were but intimated, which is the misery and mischief which comes by mens magisteriall determinations of heresies and errors, and binding mens consciences with a pretended *jure divino* upon topical reasons, it being the cause of many schismes, and much hatred between Christians, and is the true cause of [illegible] confusions and warres betweene Christians, that arise upon difference of opinion in matters of religion. I said indeed, that Mr. *Marshals reasons were not convincing to me, nor is the holding of rebaptization such a new opinion as he would make it.* But how do any passages of my *Examen* page 23. or my *Apology* page 53. prove that which you charge me with, *that when a man is baptized according to my own mind I allow him to be oft thereafter rebaptized, even so oft as he repents for sin, which by the godly is done, at least ought to be done every day oftner then once, that I allow of a frequent rebaptization, that to put the equity of the reproach of rebaptizing out of doubt*, I (whom you dubbe the *Anabaptists great Patron*, though indeed a Patron of nothing, but truth, and right) *am now come to defend the lawfulnesse of baptisme not onely twice, but if ye will ten times, yea so oft as you repent for sin, which ought to be oftner then once a day, so of Anabaptists they become Hemerobaptists and more.*

But you have a tale of some *eminent Divines* to help you out, *that in my sermon before the Honse of Commons* (for to whom else [*his*] can referre I see not, there being no other but Mr. *Marshal* and my selfe mentioned in that paragraph) *I did avow* in terminis, *that it is no fault to baptize ten times.* Now sure those *Eminent Divines*, and your self by hearkening to them, and reporting this in print without ever speaking or writing to me about it, though I lived not farre from you or them, do shew that to be true, which is every where complained of, that rigid *Presbyterians* are very apt to receive false reports, and to publish them of any that dissent from them, that they rake into every dunghil to find some

filth

filth to throw into the faces of their brethren, and therefore godly persons are very unwilling to come under their yoke. But that you may know the plain truth, I never yet preached a sermon before the House of Commons, *nor in such sermon did avow* in terminis, *that it is no fault to baptize ten times.* I have enquired about this tale, and it is conjectured by some, that this tale was hatched out of a passage of a Sermon of Mr. *Walter Cradock before the House of Commons July* 21. 1646. on 1 *John* 1. 3, 4. page 28. which was this, *When I have communion with a Saint I must not looke whether he be of such an opinion, or whether he have taken the Covenant, or have been baptized once or twice or ten times, but see if he have fellowship with the Father, and with Jesus Christ, which it's likely was misreported*; and made him in the margine put these words: *I speak not this as if my opinion were for rebaptization, &c.* This forwardnesse to misreport things done now, as it discovers much ill affection in mens spirits, and that the Presbyterian spirit, when persons grow factious, will run into undue courses as well as the Anabaptistick spirit; so it gives much cause to considerate men to doubt whether many things reported of the Anabaptists heretofore, and all taken up in your dragge-net whether true or false (which are the best pillar you have to uphold the great corruption of *Pædobaptism* or *Pædorantism* as now it deserves to be stiled) were true as they were reported.

SECT. XVI.

Of the sixteenth Crimination, *That I make it lawful for persons unbaptized to partake of the Lords Supper.*

AS for that you charge me with when you say, *Thirdly he makes it lawfull for persons before they be baptized to partake of the Lords Supper*, and referre your Reader to M M and thence to B B and chapter 3. pag. 53. when you say, *And some of their greatest Doctors hold it in no wise incongruous to admit persons to the Lords Table before they be baptized*, and for this you cite my words page 54. of my *Apology*, had you dealt candidly with me, you should have set down my opinion as I propound it, which was *that in some case it might be permitted.* But neither you nor Mr. *Marshall* have dealt fairely with me in this matter. You set not down my opinion rightly, but leave out the limitation which did right-

ly

ly ſtate my opinion, and Mr. *Marſhall* pag. 167. of his *Defence* miſreports me, *That i confeſſe I find no example of an unbaptized perſon receiving the Lords Supper*, and neither youn or Mr. *Marſhall* do take upon you to anſwer my reaſons, which are either in my *Examen* pag. 85. or in my *Apology* pag. 53, 54. but onely cenſure me *for freaks and outleaps, and a ſpice of itch after new opinions* for propounding my opinion with reaſons about a caſe of conſcience, which troubles many, and is of very frequent occurrence, in a place that lead me to ſpeak of it. But it ſeems neither Mr. *Marſhall* nor your ſelf are willing to let any thing paſſe, that may make me odious, or ridiculous, though you do but ſhew your own inconſiderateneſſe, and uncharitableneſſe, the like dealing you uſe towards me in the following charges.

SECT. XVII.

Of the ſeventeenth Crimination, *That I am a compleate* Eraſtian, *wherein reaſon is given of my doubt, that in Scripture no ſuch juridicall Excommunication is appointed as is now contended for.*

YOu ſay, *Fourthly, to ſhew how little inclineable he is to joine with the Anabaptiſts, he declares himſelf a compleat* ERASTIAN. Sir, what I ſaid, and to what end, I expreſſed plainly enough in my *Apology* page 91. The occaſion of printing what I conceived, was a paſſage in Mr. *Marſhalls Defence*, which he ſtuffed with all the exceptions he could thruſt in againſt my perſon, but anſwered little or nothing punctually in the maine points of the diſpute, (which prævarication, I may perhaps in time diſcover alſo, in your diſpute (chap. 5.) of your ANABAPTISME) The occaſion of ſpeaking in private conference, was, to ſhew my ſenſibleneſſe of the miſery of the Land, by reaſon of the preſent differences, upon ſome ſpeech that was moved by ſome friend of mine, (as I remember,) when the *Aſſembly* brought into the *Houſe of Commons*, their *Petition*, deſiring power to ſuſpend perſons from the *Lords Supper* for all ſcandals, without reſtriction; and aſſerted the *Presbyterian Government*, (unto which they adviſed the Parliament,) *to be* jure Divino, *by the will and appointment of Jeſus Chriſt*. What I ſpake then, and ſince printed;

was to shew my compassion of my native Countrey like to be ruined, by the violent asserting things disputable, to be *jure Divino*; and thereby necessitating men to oppose, lest Conscience be brought in bondage, according to the Apostles warning *Col.* 2. 20. It was not (as you say) *to shew how little inclineable I am to joine with the Anabaptists*. Nor did I declare my selfe a *Compleat* ERASTIAN in the words you alleadge at the letters N N out of my *Apology*, as you charge me; but only expresse my doubts; much lesse did *I declare my self a compleate* ERASTIAN, that is in your sense one that holds with ERASTUS in all things, wherein he differs from BEZA in the disputes between them. For whereas there are *two* main *points* in difference between them, *Excommunication*, and the *mixt Presbytery*; Concerning this *Latter*, my words in my *Apology* speak nothing against it, but rather for it, when I say, *And if any Assembly of Ministers and Rulers be set up, for the better discovery of such as live viciously, or do contrary to the Christian faith, or worship, that a person be not charged with those evils upon uncertain reports, I think it agreeable to Gods will* 1 *Tim.* 5. 19. And whereas Mr *Gillespy* in his *Aarons rod blossoming*, page 249. hath these words, *Erastus pag.* 175. *hath not spared to say, that the Magistrate may in the New Testament (though he might not in the Old,) exercise the Ministeriall function, if he can have so much leasure from his other imployments*, and pag. 315. *in very truth the* Erastians *do oppose not only the institution, but the Lawfulnesse and agreeableness to the word of God of a Church-government distinct from the civil*; yet you cannot shew that I hold either of these positions. I confesse I have read ERASTUS his *Theses & Confirmatio thesium*; but I could not do it so exactly, as I would have done it, if I had had *Beza's* book to compare with it. I have read that which Mr. *Rutherford* disputes against *Erastus* but it doth not satisfy me, in that he dictates many things without proof, which are most necessary to be proved; and proves something by the sayings of Authors, that deserve to be examined; and many times omits in reciting his Antagonists words, that which is either *most* or very *material*; and makes not his own answers punctual; which things Mr. *Mather* also chargeth him with, about another point; besides many incoherent, and imperfect speeches, and inserting things impertinent. Besides in this dispute, I conceive, Mr. *Rutherford* doth yield that, which overthroweth that which he concludeth for. As when in his *Divine right of Church-government* chap. 4. q. 1. page 223. he hath these words, *It is evident from the text* Mat. 18. 15. *that Christ speaks of such sins in a speciall manner committed against me or a particular brother, which*

are

are within the verge of my power or his to pardor, as not being yet publickly ſcandalous · which if true, then it can be meant onely of perſonal injuries, which alone a private perſon hath power to pardon, and ſo is not an inſtitution how to correct ſcandals under that notion, which Mr. *Gilleſpy* contends ſo much for, in his *Aarons rod bloſſoming*, book 2. chap. 9. page 295. and book 3. chap. 2. As for his *a gument from proportion, Chriſt did appoint this to be done in caſe of civill injuries, much more in ſcandals*: it hath no ſtrength to impoſe a thing as by Divine inſtitution upon mens conſciences; yea it is no better then a humane invention when only gathered by ſuch reaſoning; ſuch arguments from *proportions being weak probations*, as rightly Mr. *Rutherford Due right of Presbyteries* chap. 2. ſect. 2. page 37. and all Logicians acknowledge that an argument *à comparatis* is but Topical, yea eaſily overthrown if any diſparity be aſſigned. And this is enough (though much more may be ſaid) to ſhew that *Mat.* 18. 15, 16, 17. is impertinently alleadged, though it be one of the chief texts urged importunately for Church-government by Prelates, Independents, Presbyterians, even the *Aſſembly* it ſelf *Advice concerning a Confeſſion of faith* chap. 30. art. 2,4. to prove a power of excommunicating for ſins as ſcandalous, and ſo all ſcandals. And for the power of the keyes *Mat.* 16. 19. Mr. *Rutherford* chap. 3. q. 1. pag. 236. makes the power of the keyes to belong *to Church-Rulers, that are the Stewards of the houſe, and the diſpenſers of the heavenly myſteries*, but this may be only preaching the Goſpel, of which the Apoſtle ſpeaks 1 *Cor.* 4.1. which place is impertinently alleadged in the Aſſemblies confeſſion of faith chap. 27. art. 4. to prove, *neither Sacrament may be diſpenſed by any, but a Miniſter of the word lawfully ordained*, the Scripture no where calling the Sacraments myſteries, but the doctrine of the Goſpel; however the Greek Fathers oft call them ſo. As for binding, and looſing though I conceive Dr. *Hammond* hath more exactly diſputed this matter in his book of the power of the keyes, chap. 4. then others, yet I conceive it more agreeable to other places in *Matthew* (leaving Mr. *Selden* to juſtify his explication in his preface to his book of the *Calender of the Jewes* out of the Talmudiſts as he conceives fit) as *Mat.* 23.4. & 11. 28. beſides *Acts* 15. 28. *Revel.* 2. 24. *Luke* 11. 46. to draw the Metaphor from binding and looſing burdens, rather then priſoners; which is confirmed in that the phraſe is not [*whomſoever*] but [*what things ſoever ye ſhall bind on earth*] *Mat.* 18. 18. and this may very well ſtand with the coherence, ſignifying Gods ratifying in heaven the Commands of the Apoſtles, and the Church on earth in the matters wherein they are to be obeyed v. 17. and

ſo the binding and looſing belongs not to *vindicative judicature* as by Excommunication, but to *Stewardly declarative authority* what is to be done or not to be done; and conſequently proves not juridical Excommunication. I add that Mr. *Gilleſpy* in his *Aarons rod bloſſoming* book 3. c. p. 412, 413. will not have binding and looſing by a dogmatical *authoritative* declaration of the will of Chriſt here excluded, but proves this ſenſe from *Mat.* 28. 20. *Acts* 15. 28. and from the coherence with the 17. v. As for 1 *Cor.* 5. 5. Mr. *Rutherfurd* cha. 9. 4, 5. page 329. denieth not *many learned Proteſtants to conceive, that delivering to Satan might be a bodily puniſhment or conjoined therewith*, &c. yea he addeth, *and the learned* Molineus *denyeth delivering to Satan to be expounded of Excommunication, and will have the deſtruction of the fleſh to be ſome bodily tormenting of his Body by Satan, and ſo do ſundry of the Fathers, eſpecially* Ambroſe, Hieronymus, Auguſtinus, *and* Chryſoſtome, *though* Auguſtin *be doubtful*; which if true it will be hard to prove juridical Excommunication now contended for from thence. And for the 13. v. if it be read as it may, *And ye ſhall put away*, not, *therefore put away* & τὸ πονηρὸν, not τὸν πονηρὸν, *the evil thing*, not *the evill perſon*, as it's ſaid to be in a Manuſcript copy at *Saint James*, and is the more likely, becauſe it ſeemes to many learned men, that the Apoſtle tooke theſe phraſes ὁ τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο ποιήσας, v. 2. τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτο κατεργασάμενον, v. 3. καὶ ἐξαρεῖτε τὸ or τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, from the Greek verſion, *Deut.* 17. 5, 7. and 22. 21, 22, 24. it will note, not a command, but an event; and ſo it may be either expounded impersonally, as Deut. 17. 7. *ye ſhall put away the evil*, that is, the evil ſhall be put away from you, or if it be referred to their action, they may be ſaid to do it, *becauſe they mourned that he might be taken away*, ver. 2. and it was to be done when they were gathered together, ver. 4. now the phraſe of *taking away from them*, compared with thoſe places in *Deuteronomy*, with the Apoſtles ſpeech ver. 5. is more likely to be meant of killing then Excommunicating. And the putting it, ver. 13. in ſuch an abrupt manner like to that, *Deut.* 17. 7. doth give great cauſe to imagine it hath the ſame ſenſe. But if it be a command, and be referred to Excommunication with *the judging them that are within*, ver. 12. yet it cannot be gathered from the text that this was the juridical Excommunication contended for, inveſted in ſome Officers, or the people with the Officers as ſuperiour judges: but rather by verſes 9, 10, 11, 12. precedent, this *judging* and *putting away* belongs to every private Chriſtian jointly in a conſtituted Church, or ſeverally by themſelves. I have read Mr. *Gilleſpies Aarons rod bloſſoming*

Selden. l. 1. deſign. c. 8. p. 18. codices priſci, optimiq; habent τὸ πονηρὸν.

ing, and I think the ſtrength of all is in the 9. chapter of his 2. book: in which I doubt whether any of his 21. arguments will prove ſuch a forenſical Eccleſiaſtick government, as he contends for. The argument from two diſtinct governments, and judicatories to cenſure vicious manners (in which Mr. *Gilleſpy* in his firſt book ſeemes to be moſt elaborate) in the Jewiſh policy to prove the like to be among Chriſtians is many wayes faulty. It will hardly be proved the Prieſts had peculiar cognizance of ſcandalous manners, or that any was kept from the ſacrifices for moral uncleanneſſe, much leſſe that the reaſon is good, men were kept away for legal uncleanneſſe from the ſacrifices, *Ergo* much more for moral, or excluſion for legal pollution typifies excluſion for moral in the Chriſtian Church. You ſay truly in anſwer to Mr. *Cotton firſt part of your Diſſuaſive* chap. 7. pag. 172. *There is no argumenting from ſymbolick types except where the ſpirit of God in Scripture applies a type to ſuch a ſignification and uſe.* Nor is the Jewiſh policy a patterne for us. If it were we muſt have a Biſhop anſwering to an High Prieſt, a Parliament conſiſting of Biſhops and Nobles, as they had their *Synedrium* at Jeruſalem of Prieſts and Elders of the people. Theſe arguments cannot ſtand without aſſerting that the Jewiſh judicial lawes binde ſtill. I have bin the larger in this, becauſe in ſome writings eſpecially of your Nation, to be an *Eraſtian* is now counted an high crime, and if the *advice of the Aſſembly concerning a confeſſion of faith* chap. 30. ſhould be eſtabliſhed as a law, aſſertion of a Church-government corrective of manners by cenſures in a juridical way would be preſſed on us as of Divine inſtitution diſtinct from the Civil Magiſtrate, which I conceive it concerns the Aſſertors better to prove, then yet appears they have done, or elſe they will in preſſing it on others uſurpe dominion over other mens faith. But ſure in many particulars I am not of *Eraſtus* his minde, and therefore you do ill to terme me a *compleate Eraſtian*. And though I find not by *Bullingers* and *Gualther's* letters to him, *Beza's* preface to his anſwer to his *theſes*, *Philip Pareus* his Relation of his fathers life, and other wayes, but that *Eraſtus* had the repute of a worthy man, yet I take it all at your hands to be named by any name, but Chriſts, as you, and your fellow-Commiſſioners did take exception at the *Apologetical narration* of the five brethren for calling ſome Churches *Calvinian*. But how do you prove me to be a *compleat Eraſtian*?

SECT. XVIII.

Of the eighteenth Crimination, *that I avow no ſcandalous profeſſor ought to be kept from the Lords Table.*

YOu ſay, *that I avow that no ſcandalous profeſſor ought to be kept from the Lords Table*, and for proof, you referre your Reader to the letters N N, where ſome words of mine are recited out of my *Apology* page 92. which avow not any thing but my doubt, nor that of the thing it ſelf, but of the proofe, and that not out of any Scripture whatſoever, but onely the fact of delivering to Satan the inceſtuous Corinthian, 1 Cor. 5.5. Nor do I expreſſe my doubt to be how from that it may be concluded, that any ſcandalous profeſſor ought to be kept from the Lords Table: *but how hence may be concluded anypower of ſuſpenſion from the Lords Supper for every emergent ſcandal ſo judged by a Congregation or Congregational Presbytery.* Yea to ſhew how ready you are to miſ-report me, in the very next page of my *Apology* I have theſe words, *And if it happen that any ſuch facts be perpetrated as are like to that of the inceſtuous perſon, I doubt not but the whole Church may and ought to diſclaime the perſon ſo offending, and to exclude him from all brotherly Communion, becauſe I conceive ſo much was done to the inceſtuous perſon; as I gather from* 2 Cor. 2.6,7. So that my doubt was not of ſuſpenſion for any, but for *every emergent ſcandal*, for which the *Aſſembly* were ſo earneſt with the *Parliament*. Many ſcandals there are in abuſe of liberty in things indifferent, in ſins of evil councel, and example which may happen through ſtrength of temptation by infirmity in men not habitually victors, which are not of that hainous nature, as to deſerve keeping from the Lords Table; Nor doth the Scripture either preſcribe ſuch a thing to be done, or give power to do it. I like not Doctor *Amos* his determination lib. 4. *de conſcientia* c. 29. num. 7. *Proprium & adæquatum obiectum hujus cenſuræ eſt ſcandalum datum à fratre*, which I imagine was the cauſe of the *Aſſembly's* miſtake upon which they petitioned.

SECT. XIX.

Of the nineteenth Crimination *of me, that I hold no cenſure of Excommunication.*

YOu further charge me, *as avowing alſo that there is no ſuch thing as any cenſure of Excommunication*, and for proof you referre your Reader

der to the letters O O, where is cited one or two passages of my *Apology* page 91. in neither of which do I avow any thing but my doubt, which is of 5. things, whereof one is, whether ever Excommunication *a sacris*, that is (as I after expresse my self) *juridical, forensical, authoritative, Excommunication* by some officers, or the whole congregation as superiours that have jurisdiction without special gift as the Apostles had, would be proved to be *jure divino* by Christs appointment. And I confesse I have still the same doubt, notwithstanding what I have read in Mr. *Rutherford*, Mr. *Gillespy* or any other. And I should be willing to be resolved, how citing to appear by power of office, keeping Courts or Assemblies, requiring persons, yea of all sorts and qualities to answer as before Judges, examining witnesses, hearing causes, passing sentence, inflicting so great a punishment as Excommunication without liberty of Appeale (if by a national Assembly of Elders) on ministers and people, even the chiefest, not as Arbitrators to whom the parties referre the matter, but as Ecclesiastical Officers to whose judgement they must stand whether they will or no, will be acquitted from that dominion condemned *Lu.* 22.25, 26. *Mat.* 20.26. Mar. 10. 42,43. 1 *Pet.* 5.2,3. as the Assertors of the Presbyterian discipline expound the texts against the Prelates; & what dominion more like the heathen the Prelates take upon them, then such an *Assembly*, and whether the Prelates against whom you pleade may not acquit their Prelacy which they claime from the dominion you charge them with, out of these texts of Scripture as well as you. But in this I do not avow, *there is no such thing as any censure of Excommunication*, as you accuse me: yea I do expressely grant *a social medicinal Excommunication by the whole Church from all brotherly communion with the whole, and by each member from arbitrary communion with himself, provided they do not rashly or unjustly exclude.* And this I gather from 1 *Cor.* 5. 9,10,11. 2 *Thess.* 3.6, 14,15. and other places, as in my *Apology* page 93. may be seen. And I think the Congregational way in this nearer to the use of Excommunication in Scripture then the Presbyterian, though I think they misse in two things. 1. That they make it an act of superiority and jurisdiction, or, as they speak, of the power of the keyes in the whole Church over the person censured. 2. They ascribe this power only to that particular congregation of which the offender is a fixed member, which I conceive common to any other Church or brother in another Congregation, and is in effect nothing else but the non-communion

All in defence of Ans. to 9 posit. p. 171. in case the fraternity without officers should cast out any, yet it is not altogether the same with that which may be dispensed by the officers thereof it being no officiall act.

munion, which they aſcribe to one Church towards another. Nor do I conceive what other Excommunication Chriſtians could in the primitive times exerciſe or did exerciſe one towards another, when *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome* would have excommunicated *Polycrates* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, or the Weſtern the Eaſtern Church about Eaſter, or *Stephanus* of *Rome Firmilianus* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia* holding with *Cyprian* about rebaptization of perſons baptized by heretiques, then this non-communion. And for the texts *Mat.* 16. 19. *Mat.* 18. 16, 17, 18. I am not yet moved from the intetpretation I gave in my *Apology* page 91. but rather conceive that I can prove it true, notwithſtanding what I have read hitherto to the contrary.

SECT. XX.

Of the twentieth Crimination, *that I hold Chriſt hath not appointed any particular government for his Church.*

YOu ſay further, *That Chriſt hath not appointed any particular government for his Church*, and for proof hereof you referre the Reader to the letters P P, at which you cite two paſſages of my *Apology* page 91.93. of which neither ſayes the thing you charge me with, the former onely making two things, according to my conceit, prudencial, to wit, the Independency or Dependency, and the fixedneſſe or moveableneſſe of Paſtors, and Congregations. In the other I acknowledged a diſcipline proper to the Church, and ſhewed what it was. And therefore you do manifeſtly wrong me in ſaying I avow *a particular governmen*, when my words expreſſely yield the contrary, onely I ſaid, *I ſuppoſe the manner of doing the thing is left to prudence*, that is by whom, wher, in what order evils committed ſhould be examined, the perſons charged, admoniſhed, avoided, which I think you will not deny. Surely you will be hard put to it, to prove out of Scripture, the particularities of your, or any other diſcipline. To tell you my minde yet more plainly, the word government comes from the Greeke κυβέρνησις, now κυβερνήτης ὁ τὸ πλοῖον ἡγεμών, ſaith *Suidas*, *he that guides a ſhip by ſteering it*. Being applied to men I conceive government is either by counſel, directing, admoniſhing, reproving in words or actions (as by ſhewing favour or diſlike, in lookes, embra-

embracing or shunning company, &c. giving example, &c. or by giving lawes, and inflicting punishments or giving rewards. I conceive Christ hath not left a particular government for his Church the latter way, but referres that unto himself, but in the former way he hath in the hands of some Officers, whom he hath made as Stewards in his house, whose government consists chiefely in declaring the will of Christ, convincing gainsayers, ordaining Pastors to teach, and declaring false teachers to be shunned, and such like offices: but for the juridical government mentioned before I find it not appointed them by Christ. I like *Hieromes* expression on *Tit.* 1. That the Churches *eo communi presbyterorum consilio, cura, solicitudine* (not *imperio*) *guvernabantur*, and I like *Salmasius* his observation in his *Apparatus de primatu Papæ* pag. 148. & *de primatu Papæ* part. 1. cap. 1. that the government of the Church is ἐπισκοπὴ *curatio*, over-sight, not *potestas*, magistracy, empire. And this me thinks best suites with the Scriptures, 1 *Thess.* 5. 12. 1 *Tim.* 3. 5. *Heb.* 13. 7, 17. 1 *Peter* 5. 2, 3.

SECT. XXI.

Of the one & twentieth Crimination, *that I hold that the government of the Church belongs to the Magistrate onely.*

YOu add further, that I say, *that the governing of the Church belongs to the Magistrate onely, and to such whom he appoints to that service by vertue of a Commission flowing from himself.* And for proofe hereof you referre the Reader to the letters q q page 113. where you cite a passage out of my *Apology* page 93, which hath not a word of that you charge me with, but onely a declaration of my opinion in point of prudence, that the not devolving so much jurisdiction (as some desire) on a Presbytery doth not so much disadvantage the Church, as some conceive, for reformation of manners, but onely for suppressing the dissenters in opinion, who are for the most part the most conscientious, and right-hearted; For usually the ruling Elders are Magistrates, or both teaching and ruling Elders are chosen and act according to their minde, and serve their ends. And therefore if the Christian Magistrate be good, there's no great losse to the Church concerning the reforming of vicious manners, though

 the

he Presbytery have not such power as some desire: if bad, little is done by the Presbytery. And for errors in opinion they are scarce ever amended by bare Excommunication, for that (if there be any number of dissenters) doth but usually produce a schisme, but by teaching and cleering truth with meeknesse and forbearance one towards another, and a freedome to debate things in *Synods*, which is, I suppose, the proper use of them, and not to determine things and impose lawes the persons censured being never heard. This I said to allay the heate of men in engaging a Kingdome to warre upon such a cause. But because this is onely a point of prudence from experience I leave this to be considered by those that are better acquainted with humane affaires then I am. The thing you charge me with is no where asserted by me and therefore in this you also charge me falsely.

SECT. XXII.

Of my new way and boldnesse.

THere are some other things in your book wherein you abuse me, as pag. 91. in your margine and table when you put *Mr. Combes new way*, and when you say, that *at this time when so many new wayes are in hand, I have thought meet to make a hotch-potch of many of them together*; which is a meer reproachful or scoffical calumny, as if what I wrote, I did it out of a designe to make a *new way* of mine own. Whereas what I have said, I was necessitated to it, as I shew in my *Apology*, and was done in pursuance of the Covenant, and should have been taken with the right hand by men that are desirous to find out truth especially from one that you term learned, and with all his strength and greater diligence then any before him hath sifted a point. As for *my boldnesse*, I confesse God hath in mercy to me put more boldnesse and courage into me in this matter, then either agrees with my natural complexion, or the state of my affaires. But if you mean by saying *that I am a very bold man*, that I am one that is of an audacious disposition to be a ringleader in a faction or an attempter of a desperate designe, or in any other bad sense (which it's likely you mean) you are deceived, it being truth which makes me bold, which I am the more bold to avouch to be so, because having tryed your strength with my other Antagonists, I find, that you defend that which I impugne by meer sleights.

Sect.

SECT. XXIII.

Of my silence concerning DIPPING, *and of the novelty and insufficiency of* SPRINKLING *instead of baptizing.*

YOu say, that *you have marked nothing to fall from my pen for the rite of dipping, or against the custome of sprinkling.* And in the *margine* and the *table* at the end of your book you say, *He is a rigid Antipædobaptist, but not against sprinkling.* But this is more then you could infer from this, that I meddle not with this controversy in my writings. But though I say nothing, there's enough to be found of that innovation of *sprinkling*, in all sorts of authors. Mede *in his Diatribe*, or *discourse on* Tit. 3. 5 *I adde, because perhaps some mens fancies are corrupted therewith, that there was no such thing as* sprinkling *or* ῥαντισμὸς *used in baptism in the Apostles times, nor many ages after them; and therefore it is no way probable that* ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος Χριστοῦ *in St.* Peter *should have any reference to the Laver of baptism.* Salmasius *Appar. ad librum de primatu Papæ pag.* 192. *Non enim id* βαπτισμὸς *est quo hodie infantes initiant, non mersio, non tinctio, non lotio, non lavacrum, nec* λοῦτρον *ut etiam Græci vocant, & vox Baptismi Græcè significat, sed* ῥαντισμὸς *aspersio vel infusio aquæ.* The like is in his Epistle *ad Colvium* pag. 669. Ancient and later writers do generally avouch *John Baptists* and the Apostles and Ancients use for many hundreds of yeares to have been by *dipping* or *plunging under water*: Salmasius *Apparat. ad librum de primatu Papæ pag.* 193. *Tempore Hieronymi omnes Ecclesiæ hunc morem observabant in baptismo ut ter Caput sub aqua mergerent quibus id sacramentum dabatur.* Aquinas 3. part. q. 66. art. 7. *Tutius est baptizare per modum immersionis, quia hoc habet communior usus.* Chanier. *panstrat. Cathol. tom.* 4 lib. 5. c. 2. sect. 6. *Cæterùm in usu clementi ab initio immersionem fuisse totius corporis: quæ vis est* τοῦ βαπτίζειν: *unde Joannes baptizabat in flumine: deinde tamen mutatam in aspersionem: incertum quando; aut unde facto initio, &c.* The manner of dipping, plunging, or immersion under water is agreeable to the relations, *Mat.* 3. 16. *John* 3. 23. *Acts* 8. 38, 39. It is acknowledged to be alluded to by *Paul, Rom.* 6. 3, 4. by the new Annot. there; By *Calvin* in *John* 3. 22, 23. *A* Joanne *et* Christo *celebratum Baptismum fuisse totius corporis submersione.* Calv. *in* Act. 8. 38. *To*

tum corpus in aquam mergebant. Mr. *Daniel Rogers* in Treatise of two Sacraments part. 1. chap. 5. 2. Edit. page 77. saith, The Greek Tongue wants not words to expresse any other act, as well as *Dipping*, if the institution could beare it. And sur--the Lord meant not that the infant should be sprinckled onely;--but *baptized*: which word signifieth the true act of the Ministery, to *Dip*, or *Dop* the Body, or some part of it into the water. And the *essence* of Baptisme in the symbolicalnes of it, urgeth no--. --What resemblance of our burial or resurrection with Christ is there in sprinkling?--So that--they look more at themselves, then at God *therein*. And a little before he saith, To dip the infant--I so aver, as thinking it exceeding material to the Ordinance, and no sleight thing: Yea, which both Antiquity (--) constantly, and without exception of Countreys, hot or cold, witnesseth unto, and especially the constant word of the Holy Ghost, first and last approveth, as a learned Critick (*Casaubon*) in *Mat.* 3. hath noted. *Piscat. Schol. on* Rom. 6. 4. *Diodati annot. in* Rom. 6 4. *Grot. annot.* in Rom. 6. 4. &c. and *Colos.* 2. 11, 12. acknowledged by *Beza annot.* in Col. 2. 11. and *Gal.* 3. 27. *Davenan.* in *Col.* 2. 12. &c. by the *new Annot.* on *Mat.* 20. 22. to have *been the manner in Christs time; so that Keckerman. Syst. Theolog. lib.* 3. c. 8. saies, *Non possumus diffiteri primam institutionem baptismi immersionem, non verò adspersione constitisse, quod disertè patet ex cap* 6. *Roman. ver.* 3. *and* 4. Calaubon. *innot. ad* Mat. 3. 6. καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ; *hic enim fuit baptizandi ritus, ut in aquas immergerentur: quod vel ipsa vox* βαπτίζειν *declarat satis: quæ ut non significat* δύειν *quod est fundum petere cum sua pernicie: ita à profecto non est* ὑποπολάζειν. *Differunt enim hæc tria,* ὑποπολάζειν, βαπλίζειν, δύειν. *unde intelligimus, non esse absurdè quòd quampridem nonnulli disputarunt de toto corpore immergendo in ceremonia baptismi; vocem enim* βαπλίζειν *urgebant. Sed horum sententia meritò est quampridem explosa: quum non in eo posita est mysterii hujus vis et* ἐνέργεια. *Tertullian*, who lived within lesse then a hundred years of some of the Apostles, frequently calls Baptisme, *Dipping*; and saith the parties were *Dipt, Tincti*: (never sprinkled, *aspersi*, &c.) The like phrase hath *Musculus* on *Mat.* 3. &c. The *Dutch* Bibles have it thus *Mat.* 3. 1. *Johannes de Dooper. John the Dipper*, ghedoopt inden Jordaen *ver.* 6. *he dipt them in Jordan.* Mat. 28. 19. *Doopende inden Name*--*Dipping them in the Name.* So in *Mar.* 1. 5, 9. *Act.* 8. 38, &c. So Mr. *Thomas Goodwin* holds out this manner of Baptizing fully, in his Treatise of *Christ set forth in his Death, Burial*--Section 3. chap. 7. It was questioned in the third cen-

century whether the περίχυσις or sprinkling or powring about of the *element*, that is, those who when they were sick on their beds and ready to dy, were *baptized*, were true *baptisme*? *Cyprian lib.4. Epis. ad Magnum.* After it was questioned, whether a threefold *immersion* were necessary, or one would suffice? *Lumbard. sentent.* lib.4. distinct. 3. sect.9. *Aquin.* 3. part. *q.* 66. art. 8. The Jewes, (from whom this rite is conceived to come,) took the *baptisme* wherein the whole body was not baptized, to be void, *Selden de jure natur. & gent. iuxta discip. Hebr.* l. 2. c. 2. The force of the word βαπτίζω is so manifest to signifie dipping, plunging, drowning, that *Pindarus* in his *Pythia ode.* 2. calls Corke swimming ὑπὲρ ἕρκος ἅλμας ἀβάπτιστον, *upon the face of the waters unbaptized*, and *Plutarch* a ship floting on the waters ἀβάπτιστον, *unbaptized*. Insomuch that I marvel greatly, that those who hold *breaking* of bread necessary, if not essential to the Lords Supper, having but example, use of the word, and allusion for it in Scripture; yea that are so stiffe for a table gesture; should upon such pretences as these [that βαπτισμὸς sometimes signifies washing, that our Countreys are in a cold climate, or the like,] alter so confirmed a rite, and *determine that baptizing for the manner of doing it, is not onely lawful, but sufficient, and most expedient to be by pouring or sprinkling on the face of the child, in the Directory; and that dipping of the person into the water is not necessary: but baptisme is rightly administred by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person. Advice concerning confession of faith chap.* 28. *artic.* 3. and that so small a vessel should, according to their minds be set up, as that the *Primitive use* cannot be continued by those that would, and perhaps do make *conscience* of it.

SECT. XXIII.

The Conclusion requiring reparation of the wrong done to me by Mr. Baillee.

NOw Sir, I referre it to your self to judge whether any Author, Papist or Protestant, have in so small a compasse as one page of a leafe in 4. and some few lines in another so wronged his adversary, as you have done me in so many false accusations tending to beget prejudice against my wri-

writing, and hatred againſt my perſon. Which I take the worſe from you as being done not onely to a fellow-Chriſtian, and a fellow-Proteſtant, but alſo to a fellow-Miniſter of the Goſpel, whoſe life and labours are not very obſcure; yea to a fellow-Covenanter, and one with whom you ate bread at his and others invitation, out of the deſire I had to hold amity with you, and the Churches from whence you came: nor do I know that I have done or ſpoken any thing that might tend to the contrary ſince: and this have you done in print, whereby it's likely to ſpread to many, and to remaine upon record to poſterity, without any provocation by me, and without any conference with me by word or writing, which might have ſatisfied you; though living not farre from you while you were framing your book; as I conceive you could not be ignorant from ſundry paſſages in my *Apoleg*. The ſin of falſe accuſing is one of the ſins, that makes *times perilous*, 2 *Tim*. 3. 3. from whence the enemy of mankind hath his name, and from whence much of our diſunion, and miſery comes. I do now write this letter to you being remote from you, as I did write to a neere friend before, to acquaint you with theſe exceptions againſt you; having an eye on the rule of Chriſt, *Mat*. 18. 15. that I may ſhew my deſires of peace, and you may ſee trueth, and confeſſe your wronging of me, and may fully right me. If this do not take, I ſhall ſome other way endeavour to waſh away the dirt caſt in my face by you, and remaine

Mr. Henry Scudder.

Bewdley in Worceſterſhire
July 22. 1647.

Your brother and
fellow-ſervant
in *Chriſt Jeſus*

JOHN TOMBES

June 2. 1650.
Imprimatur

John Bachiler.

Sarah Boyleston